

4323  
REMARKS  
ON A LATE  
PUBLICATION,  
ENTITLED

OBSERVATIONS ON INFANT-SPRINKLING,

By WILLIAM RICHARDS:

I N

SEVEN LETTERS to that GENTLEMAN.

---

By JOHN CARTER, K  
AUTHOR OF THE REVIEWER REVIEWED.

---

*Whoſoever ſhall not receive the kingdom of God, as a little  
child, ſhall in no wiſe enter therein.*

JESUS CHRIST, Luke xviii. 17.

Conſtat autem, quando parentes discipuli Chriſti fiunt,  
LIBEROS eorum itidem DISCIPULORUM numero cen-  
ſeri. — WITSIUS, Oeconom. Fœd.

Lib. iv. cap. xvi. ſec. 42.

---

L O N D O N:

PRINTED and SOLD by R. HAWES, No. 40, Dorſet-  
Street, Spitalfields.

Sold alſo by J. BUCKLAND, Pater-Noſter-Row.

# R. E. M. A. R. K. S. ON A LATE P U B L I C A T I O N E N T I T L E D

OBSERVATIONS ON INFANT-SMOKING,  
 BY WILLIAM RICHARDS.

SEVEN LETTERS TO A GENTLEMAN.



BY JOHN T. R.

AUTHOR OF THE REVIEWER.

The Reviewer, in this work, has not only  
 shown the absurdity of the charge, but  
 has also shown the danger of the habit,  
 and the necessity of its being  
 entirely discontinued.

L O N D O N.

Printed and Sold by H. H. H. No. 40, Pall Mall.  
 Sold also by J. B. B. No. 1, Pall Mall.



---

## A D V E R T I S E M E N T.

**T**H E author of the following pages did not design to have written any more on the subject in debate, but as misrepresentation calls aloud for animadversion, he was constrained again to take up his pen. His intention, at first, was merely to have taken notice of those particulars which had been misrepresented, and to have remonstrated against conduct of that kind, but, having repeatedly perused his opponent's performance, with care and attention, he judged it would not be improper to offer some REMARKS on the work in general. A minute examination of every thing there advanced as an argument, since it would be only repeating what has been done already, he thought unnecessary; if the reader, therefore, shall perceive any articles of this nature  
in

in the OBSERVATIONS, which are passed by in the REMARKS, it is hoped he will compare them with those places of the REVIEWER REVIEWED to which they have a reference, and then decide on the merits of the cause, as his judgment shall direct.

The Reader is requested to forgive and correct the following typographical mistakes, or any others which may have escaped notice.

Page 10, line penult, to *Observ. &c.* prefix § p. 13. l. 4, after *Water* add † and at the foot of the Page † *Observ.* p. 18. p. 14. l. 8, for *rules* read *rites*. p. 15, l. 21, dele *Religion*. p. 22, l. 18, for *promise* r. *promises*. p. 31, l. 11, after *read*, dele “p. 40, l. 4, after *Baptism*” place and d. \* p. 41, l. 7, f. “*iban*” r. “*iban*” p. 43, l. 12, f. *Isaiab* xlv. 23. r. *Isaiab* lxx. 23. p. 47, l. 14, d. *their* p. 48, l. 12, d. § insert † p. 50, l. 24 & 25, f. “*canal*” r. “*carnal*” and after *flesh*, add ? p. 54, before the note place\* p. 55, l. 9, d. “before “*What does* p. 64, l. pen. f. page 44, r. p. 4. p. 69, l. 16, Place “—before *Where as* and blot them out at the beginning of the next line.

I AU 59



---

R E M A R K S  
ON A L A T E  
P U B L I C A T I O N, &c.

---

L E T T E R I.

REVEREND SIR,

I Have read your late Pamphlet, which you were pleased to entitle "OBSERVATIONS ON INFANT SPRINKLING, OR AN ANSWER to a certain Publication, Entitled, The REVIEWER REVIEWED, in a Series of Letters to the AUTHOR." It was indeed contrary to my design to write any more in the controversy between us, not being in the least ambitious to have the last word, yet certain considerations prevail with me to recede from my intention, so far as again to take up my pen; not that I am convinced you have "written fairly\*," for I think the reverse to be the truth—the decision however I

A

leave

\* *Reviewer Reviewed*, &c. page 132, and last.

a



leave to such candid readers as may be disposed to hear both sides with impartiality.

I think it must be owned you have used great freedom, particularly in your *first Letter*, respecting some things, which to my view have no immediate connexion with the subject under debate, for which undoubtedly you had your reasons, but, as I apprehend, dispassionate readers will ever deem controversial pieces, especially on religious topics, the less interesting, the more they abound in circumstances *merely personal*, or with which the community hath no concern, nor the subject any connexion, I shall very briefly touch on a few of those *personalities*; it being my chief design to examine the merits of your performance, in various particulars, as they appear to my mind, on a review of the arguments made use of in your *Letters* to me.

Your remarks on the "*Style*" of the *Reviewer Reviewed*\*, do not affect the cause in debate between us, accordingly they do not give me the least uneasiness: I am perfectly satisfied that my readers should determine on "*my style*," and "*manner of reasoning*," to which it seems my *Style* "*is very well suited*," as they please.—"*My Dedication*,"

I think

\* *Observ. &c.* page 5.

I think you ought to have left to my own breast, and the sentiments of "my much respected Brethren and Friends" to whom it is addressed. You call my *Reviewer Reviewed* "an artful address to the prejudices and passions of my congregation, to whom it is dedicated\*." As my own heart acquits me, to *them* I appeal, and with *them* chearfully leave the decision. They must be the most competent judges in the case, who are best acquainted with my usual mode of address, and not one among them will, I believe, accuse me of using *flattering Words*; pardon me then, Sir, if, in this instance, I hold *your* opinion rather cheap.—In a following page † you charge me with "conduct not strictly consistent with the laws of good manners," respecting "a certain letter, which," you say, "I sent some time ago, to a friend of yours in my neighbourhood." *This* charge I am willing to meet in all its force. In the *Letter* alluded to, I own I *accused* your Friend, but, it was because *he had been accused to me*. That Letter contained not one syllable relating to you or any of your friends, the person just referred to alone excepted. The *subject* of the letter was a matter entirely *personal*, and "my own conduct," in that particular, I shall always

A 2

avow

\* *Ibid.*—† page 12.



avow to be *strictly just and perfectly honourable*. I  
 did *accuse*, but, I did not *smite in the dark*. I de-  
 livered up his *accusers*, and gave your friend an  
 opportunity to clear himself from the charge.  
 He did so—and, I have long been convinced  
*there was a mistake in the affair*. Your friend as-  
 sures me, you never saw the letter, nor, had  
 any authority or direction from him, to take no-  
 tice of it in the manner you have. This brings  
 to my mind a certain passage—*Report, say they, and*  
*we will report it*. In the same Place where you  
 bring this charge against me, you hold up “my  
 congregation” to the view of your readers in a  
 very dishonourable point of light, because, it  
 seems, an instance or two had happened, wherein  
 language was used, which deserves to be the ob-  
 ject of your contempt, as it is of my abhorrence.  
 Admitting, that, an individual or two, (for I  
 never heard the charge extended to more) did in  
 the heat of temper, and violence of debate, use  
 such expressions as those you have mentioned \*, is  
 it candid, is it just, Sir, to fix a stigma on the  
 whole congregation? I leave it to every one to  
 judge, whether the charge be not ungenerous as  
 well as unfair, when it is known that this very  
 congregation have more than once offered the  
 right-hand of Christian Fellowship to some of  
 your



your denomination. On this occasion permit me to lay before you a remark of *Dr. Wall* \*, speaking of those great men, *Scaliger* and *Luther*, he says they “gave their pens too much liberty in censorious and extravagant expressions, but it seems they gave their tongues more. And they had after their death, friends, or else enemies, who published to the world all their rash sayings, spoken in passion, dispute, or *table-talk*, which course, if it were taken with the best men that are, would expose their characters. It is well when a man’s sedate thoughts are worth publishing: *Nobody’s tattle is.*”—Your insinuations that I am willing my people should attend only to “a partial representation of the dispute between us †,” are groundless and unjust. I have, in every Instance, recommended the perusal of your pamphlet, when the mention of what I had written, or conversation on the subject of our controversy, gave me opportunity. Who those “by-standers,” then, are, who “probably will think it” [my conduct] “rather ungenerous,” I am not concerned to know. Perhaps some will say, you imagine, no one can peruse your writings with attention, but he must be convinced by your reasoning, and, as this does not appear to

A 3

be

\* *Defence*, &c. page 316, &c.—† *Observ. &c.* page 7.

§ *Ibid.*

be the case in "my congregation," you infer, that, your publication has not been attended to; though I do not know one instance among my People, where mine has been read, and yours has not been perused likewise. That "I have," as you write, "some have affirmed,—raised an outcry against my opponent when I could not refute his arguments\*," or indeed, "raised an outcry against him", on any consideration, is said without the least foundation. How far I am able to "refute the arguments of my opponent," I leave to the Judgment of others, while I assure you that I am willing to abide by what I have written, when attended to with impartiality and candour. In what manner, you, my "opponent," have paid such attention to *the Reviewer Reviewed*, or indeed to the subject therein discussed, I proceed to enquire.

I am,

SIR, &c.

LETTER



## L E T T E R H.

REVEREND SIR,

I Shall begin the enquiry mentioned at the close of my former letter, with your endeavour to fix a charge on the learned Dr. Owen, as to the meaning of the word βαπτίζω (*baptize*) "Dr. Owen," you write\*, "contradicts a great part of what his learned coadjutors had affirmed. Gerard had said, that, the primitive word properly signifies any washing, as well as immersion, but Dr. Owen affirms, that it never does in Scripture either necessarily or properly signify to immerse. Which of these, Sir, are we to believe?" I reply, the passages fairly quoted, as they stand in my last pamphlet†, will evince to any attentive reader, that, there is, in reality, no contradiction between those writers. Gerard's Words are, "Baptism and to baptize, are used in holy Scripture either properly or in a metaphorical manner, properly they signify in general, any washing as well as immersion, Gerard, vol. 4, page 415.— Dr. Owen says, "No one instance can be given in the Scripture, wherein Baptizo doth necessarily signify

\* Page 19.—† Reviewer Reviewed, &c. page 25, 26.



signify either to *dip* or *plunge*. 1. It doth not signify properly to *dip* or *plunge*, for that in Greek is *εμβάπτω* [embapto] and *εμβάπτίζω* [embaptizo.] 2. It no where signifies to *dip* but as a mode of, and in order to, *washing*. 3. It signifies the *dipping* of a finger, or the *least touch* of the water, and not *plunging the whole body*. 4. It signifies to *wash* also, in all good authors. Dr. Owen on infant Baptism and dipping\*.” Thus stand my quotations; and is it not astonishing, that while Gerard affirms, that to *baptize* signifies *any washing, as well as immersion*; so plainly calling *immersion* one kind of *washing*, and Dr. Owen allows that word signifies to *dip* as a mode of, and in order to, *washing*, wherein both agree that the proper meaning of the word is to *wash*, is it not, I say, amazing, that you could affirm, in the face of the public, “that two of my principal vouchers glaringly contradict one another?” I hope you will not hereafter mention this as an instance how “vulnerable†” you found your opponent.

Your arguments on Mark vii. 4. and Luke xi. 38†, do not appear to support your cause with any

\* Complete Collection of Sermons, &c. fol. 1721, page 575, 581.

† Observ. &c. page 19.—† Id, page 5,—† page 17, &c.

any probable degree of evidence. Whosoever compares *those passages* together will find, that, the Pharisees murmured against the disciples, and against Christ, for the same cause, eating bread with *unwashed*, or, if you please, *unbaptized*, hands; your saying therefore that "Luke xi. 38. seems evidently to refer to the washing or bathing the whole body," because, "we do not find the least mention there either of hands or feet, or of any one part of the body more than another" is without the least foundation, since in Mark vii. 2, 3. the *hands* are expressly mentioned, and the cases appear entirely parallel; the cause of the Pharisees wonder being the same in both places. It may indeed be granted that, as you remark, "Maimonides says, 'If the Pharisees touched but the garments of the common people they were defiled and needed immersion, and were obliged to it\*,'"—Yet it should be observed, that,—"*If the Pharisaic severity might possibly subject those very precise persons, to such a total immersion, at all times, even in the depth of winter, whenever they came from market, it cannot be imagined that, all the Jews, (and them the Evangelist Mark expressly mentions), did the same,* Dr. Pocock proves from *Maimonides*, and the whole

\* *Id*, page 18.



whole body of the Rabbins, that the Jews (in general) had no such custom\*." You wish me "to turn to Levit. xi. 32." where you say "I shall find that such defiled things as Mark mentions in the latter part of that passage were to be cleansed by being put into *Water*†." On this, Sir, permit me to observe, that the passage in *Leviticus* speaks of what they were *obliged to do*, in certain cases, *by the Divine Law*, whereas, the passage in *Mark* represents our Lord as reproving them for their *Superstition*, therefore certainly not for observing a divine command to cleanse things ceremonially polluted, to which the words in *Leviticus* have an undoubted reference. And since according to the account given by *Luke*, our divine Master taxes the hypocrisy of the Pharisees, in language that manifestly alludes to their great care to *keep clean the outsides of cups and platters*, I think it seems very plain that the passage now under consideration refers to such *washings* or *baptisms*, as were performed, not by putting the things mentioned *into the water*, but, by *applying the water to them*. However there is another criticism advanced on Mark vii. 4. which may be just noticed. It seems "the oriental versions"—read the Passage thus—*What they buy in the Market, unless it*

\* *Dipping not the only Scriptural and primitive manner of Baptizing, &c.* page 10.—† *Observ. &c.* page 17.



*it be washed, they eat not* ; from which you conclude  
 “ were we to suppose this to be the meaning,  
 there is reason to think, that the washing was a  
*putting into water.*” But (that I may reply to you  
 in the words of Dr. *Wall* \* to Dr. *Gale*, who used  
 the same argument,) “ Will any body make a  
 question whether other things besides Herbs were  
 sold at Market ? He,” (Dr. *Gale*,) “ should have  
 altered St. *Mark*’s words more yet, and made him  
 speak of a Herb-market. Does he think that  
 Wheat, Meal, Honey, Milk, Salt, &c. were  
 dipped in Water before they were eaten ? ”

Your reply to what I advanced on Hebrews ix.  
 10. will not I am persuaded be admitted as an  
 answer, by any intelligent and candid reader. The  
 whole you have adduced is thus expressed † “ With  
 respect to Heb. ix. 10. the absurdity of citing it  
 in defence of sprinkling and against dipping, be-  
 comes sufficiently clear, by only observing that  
 sprinkling is never considered in Scripture as any  
 washing at all, and that the Legal washings for pu-  
 rification were always performed by immersion.” If  
 there are any readers to whom this is “ sufficiently  
 clear,” by your “ only observing it,” I must think  
 them very free in giving you credit. I beg leave to  
 repeat a remark I have made in my former Pam-  
 phlet,

\* *Defence*, &c. page, 121.—† *Observ.* &c. page 19.

phlet\*. "That the Apostle speaks of unclean persons in Hebrews ix. we allow, but that he does so in the 10th *verse*, has not yet been made evident." However should it be admitted, that the *divers baptisms* he mentions, include among other things, the divers washings of unclean Persons, as performed on them by the Priest, it may be observed, that *the priest*, among the various ~~rules~~ he is directed to use to *sanctify and cleanse* a person, and receive him into the Church, is never once directed to dip or plunge him in water, but, only to sprinkle or pour it on him†. And, as to your asserting, "that the legal washings for purification were always performed by immersion," it maybe sufficient only to observe, that, an application of water expressly for the purpose of *cleansing or purification*, is directed to be by *sprinkling*, in the case of the *Levites*§. I am therefore, Sir, still of opinion, (any thing you have advanced to the contrary notwithstanding) that, by *divers baptisms*, the Apostle intended *divers or different modes of applying water to the subject, for cleansing or purification*, so that *sprinkling, pouring, or washing, with water, is by him denominated baptism*, and as the New Testament Rite of Baptism is eminently expressive of *cleansing* and

\* *Reviewer-Reviewed* page 33.—† Levit. xiv. 4, &c.  
§ Numbers, viii. 5, 6, 7, 21.



and *purification*, which can really be effected only by the *sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ*, and the *pouring out his Spirit upon us*, I am fully persuaded that any of the above mentioned modes of applying water to the subject may be very properly and rightly made use of, nor do I think that *immersion was used either by John Baptist, or the Apostles*. A very sensible writer, to whom I have already referred, observes that—"The priest's *plunging* a person in order to his *separation or cleansing*, is a ceremony quite *strange*, and absolutely *unheard of* through all the sacred Records. Persons were indeed on some occasions, directed to plunge or bathe *themselves*, but that one Man should take another and plunge him under water is a thing utterly *uncommanded, unprecedented, and unknown*, throughout the whole Constitution and History of the Jewish Church. It may therefore strongly be presumed, not to have been the practice either of *John* or of *Jesus Christ*, when the Christian ~~religion~~ was set up. For *John* being of the priestly race, and beginning his ministrations, agreeable to their Law, at thirty years old, and using like them an *Application of Water* to the Body, as an emblem of *moral purity*, it is left to any impartial Judgment—whether he is most rationally supposed to have plunged men under water, (a

B

thing

thing unpractised amongst them) or whether he only *sprinkled* or *poured* water on them (a Rite *divinely* instituted, and every day familiarly practised in that Church\*.)")

My views of the persons, circumstances, times, and places, of baptism, will not allow me to think, that this ordinance was always, if ever, performed by immersion. When I consider that *different modes of applying water* to persons are called *Baptisms*, by the inspired Penman of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*; that, the Scripture uses the word βαπτίζω [*baptize*] when only part of the body was washed; and that the other particulars already mentioned§ have not been set aside—I see no cause to depart from my former opinion “that dipping is not essential to the administration of baptism, and not only so, but that, *pouring*, or *washing with water*, are more proper modes of administering that ordinance.” Indeed did I think that the Apostles of our Lord, at some times, and in certain circumstances, did *baptize by immersion*, (which I do not believe) even then I could not be persuaded, *that was always the case*. If it be allowed, that *immersion* was practised early by some in the Christian Church,

\*Dipping not the only Scriptural and primitive manner of Baptizing, &c. page 24, note.—§ Reviewer Reviewed, page 16, &c.



it must be admitted, also, that *they baptized naked*. The writings of many of the ancients give testimony to the latter as really as to the former.—So Archbishop Tillotson\*, Dr. Owen†, and others, who were no strangers to Ecclesiastical History, assure us; and Dr. Wall, in his *History of Infant Baptism*, which is undoubtedly an elaborate and considerable performance, has made this abundantly manifest. This then being evident, that (to use the words of the last-mentioned writer) “*The ancient Christians when they were baptized by immersion, were all baptized naked, whether they were men, women, or children*†,” I cannot feel myself in the least moved by the authority of such ancients, to believe, that immersion was the practice of the Apostles of Christ, who enjoined the Churches to *do all things decently*, or that the administration of, or submission to, the baptismal washing in this way, was under the sanction of Apostolic Example.

On this part of the subject, you charge me with having made “a representation of what you had said” respecting your inferences as to the use of

B 2

the

\* Sermons on 2 Tim. ii. 19.—† Complete Collection of Sermons, page 581.—† History of Infant Baptism, p. ii. l. 9. f. 3. § Observ. &c. page 20.

the Greek particles *εν* (*en*) *εις* (*eis*) *απο* (*apo*) "very far from being fair and just."—To this I shall only say—My whole argument turned on the *indefinite nature of those prepositions*, and I leave it to every impartial reader to determine whose arguments are fairest and most conclusive yours or mine.

What you have advanced\* to justify your conduct in holding communion with none but dipped disciples, will bear you out, when you can prove, that the Lord's Supper belongs to *such only*, or that Christ has no disciples but such as have been immersed. You write, indeed, near the close of your pamphlet†, that, "those who make it" ("immersion of the whole body") "a term of communion—act from a real persuasion that the primitive Christians had been all dipped, before their admission to the Lord's Table";—but as there are some Christians of another mind, who yet *by one Spirit are all baptised into one body*‡, they think that they have an equal right to be *Partakers of that one bread*§, in the administration of the Lord's Supper.

Thus, Sir, having taken as much notice of your *first and second Letters*, as appeared to me at present necessary, I shall now proceed to your *third Let-*

*ter,*

\* *Observ. &c.* page 24, 25.—† page 74.—‡ 1 Corinth. xii. 13.—§ 1 Corinth. x. 17.



( 19 )

ter, that I may enquire whether you have made  
good the charge with which that part of your  
*Observations* is introduced, that I have *argued*  
*backwards\**.

I am,

S I R,

Yours, &c.

\* *Observ. &c. page 25, &c.*

B 3

Page 26, &c.

## L E T T E R III.

REVEREND SIR,

THE first thing which now calls my attention is, what you have written respecting my "remarks, on Acts ii. 38, 39.—*Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the Gift of the Holy Ghost; for the promise is to you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.\**" I perceive you still attempt to maintain your old ground, that the "promise" mentioned in this passage, intended the promise of the Spirit in his miraculous operations only, and deny in the most peremptory manner, that the expression "*to all that are afar off,*" applies to the Gentiles; on which, after many words, you sum up the whole, with a magisterial triumph over your opponent. Have you never read of some who triumph and yet never obtain the victory?



victory? Judge, Sir, whether this is not your case. At the close of your arguments on *this* passage, you address me in the following terms\*,—  
 “If however you continue still of the same sentiments concerning the above promise, I would recommend it to you to consider and answer the following plain objection.—If that promise *includes* the miraculous or extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, and is common to all whom God hath called, and to all ages of the Gospel dispensation, then none can have any evidence that they are called of the Lord, but such as are endued with those gifts,” and then, as if you had done your business effectually, you are pleased to add†“—If any will call this *turning your artillery against yourself*, they must blame you for giving me an opportunity to do so.” What opportunity I gave you for *turning my artillery against myself*, let my own words declare. After having laid before the Reader my reasons for judging, 1. That children in the promise intend the infant-offspring of those to whom it has a reference; and 2. That the Gentiles are designed by that expression *all that are afar off*; I proceeded 3. To give my reasons why I did, and still do conceive that the  
 promise

\*Page 32. &c. †Ibid

promise mentioned in the words, meant that illustrious Covenant-promise made to *Abraham*. My words are\*, “We apprehend it must mean either the promise contained in the Abrahamic Covenant, or the promise of the Spirit in his miraculous influences, expressed in that of Joel. That it was not the latter, exclusively, without any reference to the former, appears to us : *First*. Because the Apostle we think, had intimated the accomplishment of that prophecy in great part, in the extraordinary and miraculous effects of the holy Spirit which fell upon them. Standing up to vindicate his brethren, he says, “These are not drunken as ye suppose,—*But this is that which was spoken by the Prophet Joel, &c.*” which he argues was an attestation of the fact that Jesus Christ was raised from the dead, and had fulfilled the promises made unto his Apostles (compare verse 32, 33. with Acts i. 4. also John xiv. 16, 17, 26. —xv. 26.—xvi. 13, 14.). And as we are told, that “*Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law—that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles, through Jesus Christ, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.*” (Gal. iii. 13, 14.), we apprehend the Abrahamic Covenant promise

\* *Reviewer Reviewed, &c.* page 42, &c.



promise is here principally designed, the blessings of which are secured to us by the death of Christ, and that therefore the Gentiles as well as Jews were now interested in all the privileges of the Gospel dispensation, both as to the extraordinary as well as common influences of the holy Spirit; the *former* so far, and in such instances as divine Wisdom saw necessary, the *latter* as the common privilege of all the saints—and if infants are capable of being made meet for heaven, I suppose it will be granted; that meetness, (call it by what name you please) is the effect of the Spirit's agency, in accomplishing the purpose of God towards them; consequently, their interest in the promise is a most encouraging circumstance.” Thus you see, Sir, *the promise* under consideration, according to my view of it, includes the “*extraordinary as well as common influences of the holy Spirit; the former so far, and in such instances as divine wisdom saw necessary,*” and proper to qualify certain persons in an extraordinary manner to preach the Gospel, and bear witness to Christ in peculiar circumstances, during a particular period, at the commencement of the Christian dispensation; “*the latter*” to be the standing “*privilege of all the Saints,*” in every age.

Before

Before I take notice of the reason you assign to prove the Gentiles were not intended in the expression "*as far off*," and that the promise to which we are attending, *does not belong to the present Generation of Christians*, I beg leave to confirm the sentiment I have before avowed\*, that "the Abrahamic Covenant-promise is that which Peter principally designed in this passage." That it is so appears to me abundantly evident from that Apostle's address "to the people," in the immediately following chapter§. Having charged the guilt of crucifying the Lord Jesus on them, (as he had accused those who heard him on "*the Day of Pentecost*,") he in like manner urges them to repent, in the most persuasive terms†, adding‡, "*ye are the children of the Prophets, and of the Covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto ABRAHAM, AND IN THY SEED SHALL ALL THE KINDRED OF THE EARTH BE BLESSED.*" Now, as Peter was speaking on the same subject, and addressing people in the same predicament with those to whom he preached on "*the Day of Pentecost*," urging them "*to repent that their sins might be blotted out*," and enforcing his exhortation with the encouraging thought, that "THEY

\* *Reviewer Reviewed*, &c. page 42.—§ Acts iii.  
 † verse 19—24. ‡ verse 25.



WERE THE CHILDREN OF THE COVENANT WHICH GOD MADE WITH ABRAHAM, to whom he said, *In thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed*—is it not clear, that it is the same promise to which he refers? “No,” perhaps you will reply, for, in the former passage, he had said, “*ye shall receive the Gift of the Holy Ghost,*” whereas in the latter, not even an hint of that kind is given by him.” “Not even an hint of that kind given by him!” How then, Sir, are we to account for the manner in which the Apostle Paul introduces this passage which Peter quotes, and for his reasoning on it.\* “*The Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen, through faith, preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed.—Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us—that the blessing of Abraham might come upon the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit, through faith*”? So that the Abrahamic Covenant Promise according to the Apostle’s reasoning, evidently included the promise of the Spirit to be given unto, or bestowed upon, the Church, in every instance common or extraordinary, as should be suited to advance the kingdom of Christ; of which kingdom

\* Gal. iii. 8, 13, 14.

dom our Lord declares the infants of those who profess faith in his name to be a part†. Indeed the Abrahamic Covenant-Promise includes all the promises of blessings appertaining to the Church of God in every age. These circumstances much confirm me in supposing that, it is not only “possible” (to use your own language‡) “a child who reads his Bible” may mistake the meaning of that passage, but that it has been actually mistaken by *yourself*.

Having thus enquired, what is intended by *the promise* in the words before us, I shall advert to your *reasons for denying that the Apostle's expression, “ALL THAT ARE AFAR OFF” can apply to the Gentiles.* “My chief reason” you write\* “against admitting that, the Apostle meant the *Gentiles* is, that, it would exhibit his moral character in such an unfavorable point of view, as to be beyond the possibility of exculpation.” We will try presently if we cannot clear this great Apostle's “moral character” from the charge you have brought against it, but I shall first attend to what you further alledge§. “It is fact, Sir, and

‡ Mark x. 14.—† *Observ. &c.* page 30.—\* page 29.

§ *Ibid.*



and you cannot deny it, that he did not understand till long after the day of Pentecost, that the Gentiles were interested in the promise;" and, afterwards you tell us—"the question is—whether the Apostles—in preaching the Gospel—ever told their hearers what they themselves did not know or understand?"—Let us, for a moment, examine this matter, I hope we shall find that *investigation* leads to truth. It seems *Peter's* "moral character" must be given up, if the *Gentiles* are meant by those who are AFAR OFF, because "he did not understand till long after the day of Pentecost, that they were interested in the promise." Did the Prophets, Sir, *who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost\**, always understand the full import of their own words, even when under the extraordinary influence of that divine Agent? Read this Apostle's expressive declaration on this head†, *Of which salvation the prophets have enquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you, searching what, or what manner of time, the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified before-hand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow.* If Peter "did not understand, that, the Gentiles were interested in the promise," what could he mean by

C

\* 2 Peter, i. 21.—† 1 Peter, i. 10, 11.

by his application of that assurance of God to *Abraham, in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed*, in the discourse to which I have already referred? \* Will you say “he was speaking to *Jews*, and meant only *those who were scattered throughout divers parts of the world*,” can you or any one else shew, how so large an expression, as *all the kindreds of the earth*, could be understood, or can be explained, of *the Jews only*? Though *Peter*, on “the day of Pentecost,” or “till long after it,” did not know, *when* the Gentiles were to be called, that he, and, the other Apostles did know *they were to be called*, we have the greatest reason to believe †. Can it be supposed, that, those holy and inspired men, who, it must be acknowledged,

---

† Gentium vocationis arcanum Petrus nondum norat, nec si nosset, Judæis tunc adhuc novitiis, id patefieri expediebat. Resp. Ægrè credo Apostolum Scripturarum peritissimum, et jam Spiritu Sancto illuminatum, vocationem Gentium, quam tot prophetæ toties et tam clarè prædixerant, quamque hodierni quoque Judæi futuram tempore Messiae agnoscunt, aliquando futuram ignorasse. Nec obstat historia, Act. x. Sciebat Petrus vocandos fore Gentes, quando, ignorabat.—*Poli Syn. in Acts ii. 39. e Beza et L. de Dieu.*

\* Acts iii. 12, &c.



ledged, understood many of the Old Testament Prophecies, had no knowledge of *this great Event*? Was it not foretold, in a great number of those predictions? Was it not the language of God to his church, *The Gentiles shall come to thy light*, and, *The Gentiles shall see thy Righteousness*\*—not to mention many other passages of the same nature? Did not good old *Simcon* prophesy of Christ, as *a light to lighten the Gentiles*†? And was not the manner in which the Apostle *Peter* expressed himself, before the *Apostles and Elders* assembled at *Jerusalem*, very remarkable, when we are told, “*He rose up, and said unto them, Men and Brethren, ye know how that a good while ago, God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel*†”—Language which seems to indicate, that the Apostles knew the Gentiles were to be called, though they did not know the time of their calling, till it pleased God to reveal it to *Peter*? Nor did this Apostle’s hesitation to go unto the Gentiles§, in the least militate against this, for though he knew, as has been already observed, that the Gentiles were to be called, he knew not, that he was to be employed in calling them, till assured of it, by that important miracle which

C 2

was

\* *Isaiah*, lx. 3. lxii. 2.—† *Luke*, ii. 32.—† *Acts*, xv. 6, &c.—§ *Chap. x.*

was wrought on purpose to instruct and confirm him in this weighty matter.

For these reasons, Sir, it appears clear to me, that *Peter knew the Gentiles were to be called*, and I am obliged to you for giving me an opportunity to place *this part of the subject* in a somewhat clearer light than that in which it stood before me, when the *Reviewer Reviewed, &c.* was written. If what I have now introduced will bear the test, *Peter's* "moral character" is secured, notwithstanding you thought, I must bring him in guilty to clear myself.

Before I leave the important passage we are now considering, it may be proper to suggest a thought or two, as to what\* you have advanced concerning "my *second* reason for understanding by *children*," in this text, "the *infant seed*" of the persons to whom the words have a reference—"its being said, *the promise is to you and to your children*;" "which," you say, to me, "is expressive, you think, of their immediate interest in it, upon their parents evangelical repentance." So "I think" still, Sir, though you add, "Surely it must be very strange, that, you should not observe

\* *Observ. &c.* page 27.



observe, when you wrote this, that the word is applies to *all that are afar off*, and *as many as the Lord our God shall call*, as well as to those converts and their children. Had you but considered this, you must have seen the futility of this argument." Why so?—Because it seems, "I said, upon the principles of my opponents, the text should read, 'The promise is to you and shall be to your children!'"—In reply to which you write—"And may not I add? Upon your principles, Sir, the text should read The promise shall be to all that are *afar off*; and the promise shall be to as many as the Lord our God shall call?"—This by no means follows—It only proves, what the Apostle's words declare, and every Minister of the Gospel has ground to affirm—that *the promise is equally extensive to the Gentiles as to the Jews, to them and to their children.*

I am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

---

 LETTER IV.

REVEREND SIR,

**A**LMOST immediately after you have finished your observations on what I had written, concerning Acts ii. 38. which I have considered in my last *Letter*, a passage presents itself of which some notice must be taken. In the *Review*\*, you had said, that “As they” (the Apostles) “never baptized any but such as were first made disciples, by preaching the Gospel to them; so neither did they ever teach men to obey the laws of Christ till they were baptized disciples.” On which I remarked† “if none were the subjects of christian exhortation but *baptized disciples*, then I gather, even from my opponent’s principles, that *children* were *baptized* and esteemed *disciples* also;” adding in support of this sentiment, the Apostle’s exhortations, “*Children obey your parents in the Lord*,”—“*Children obey your parents in all things, for this is well*

\* Page 22.—† *Reviewer Reviewed*, &c. page 63.



*well pleasing unto the Lord.*" Upon which you exclaim\*—"I did know, indeed, that the Apostle had said so, but I confess I never knew till now, that he was then *addressing himself to new-born infants.*" Sir, did I say he was? If you had attended to my words with the least care, you must have known the contrary. How deplorable the situation of that writer, who, to extricate himself, must put words into the mouth of his opponent which he never made use of! The argument stands yet against you, in all its force,—controvert it if you can. On your own principles, you must either deny, that the Apostle's words amount to an exhortation "to obey the laws of Christ," or, you must admit, that, all the children of such as professed the faith in *Ephesus* and *Colosse* "were baptized disciples!"—You address me, indeed, in the following polite and friendly language†,—“I am much mistaken if your conscience will not tell you, that you ought to blush, for having published such childish and senseless remarks.”—Sir, you are “much mistaken”—my “conscience” does not reproach me. I neither feel, nor think I ought to feel, any “blush” glowing on my cheek; and far from apprehending you have overturned or shaken  
my

\* *Observ. &c.* page 34.—† Page 35.

my argument, I verily believe I shall maintain it, till, as *Mr Bunyan* said, respecting open communion\*, “the moss grows upon my eyebrows.”

Acts ii. 38, 39. having been attended to, your “plain observations” on 1 Cor. vii. 14. *The unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband, else were your children unclean, but, now are they holy, come under consideration.* The reasons you introduce to prove that, these words “never can afford the smallest aid to the cause of infant-baptism” are thus arranged “1. The Apostle speaks not a word about baptism in that place, therefore, it must be quite improper and absurd, and even a manifest sign of a bad cause, to look for the law of that ordinance there. 2. The holiness of the children there mentioned is not the effect of the faith of the converted parent.—It is not said they are holy because one parent is a believer; but it is plainly declared that their holiness proceeds from another quarter: Therefore your pleas for the holiness of believers infants, as such, and their right to baptism, in consequence of that, have not the least foundation in this passage.— 3. The holiness of those children is evidently derived

\* *Monthly Review*, for Dec 1781, page 474.

† *Obierv. &c.* page 35, &c.



derived from the sanctification or holiness of the unbelieving parent; for the words are, *the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: else, (i.e. if the unbeliever had not been so sanctified) were your children unclean; but now (i.e. inasmuch as the unbeliever is sanctified) are they holy.*—4. The holiness of the children being derived from that of the unbelieving parent, is a plain proof, that the holiness of the children cannot be of a sort superior to that of the unconverted parent, but is exactly of the same sort” Such, Sir, are your “observations” on this “famous passage,” which you say, “some have turned and twisted and tortured, in order to make it in some sort subservient to their own unscriptural views.”

Great violence appears to me to have been done, in these lines, to this part of the inspired volume. To your *first* Remark no reply is necessary, till you prove it either improper or absurd to use our reason in comparing one passage of Scripture with another, that we may form a just and comprehensive view of the whole. Our infallible Teacher proved the resurrection of the dead from a passage of the Old Testament, in which neither the terms *death* or *resurrection* are mentioned. In the *second* observation, you affirm, “It is not said they,” [the children

children] “are holy, because one parent is a believer.” To *this*, it appears to me, nothing more is requisite, as an answer, than to recite the Apostle’s words—*The unbelieving husband is sanctified by, or to, the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by, or to, the husband, else were your children unclean, but now are they holy.*

Your *third reason* (if it may be called a reason) amounts to an assertion of the same kind with the former, and therefore needs no other reply than has been given to *that*. Not one thing appears to me plainer than that *the unbeliever’s being sanctified by or to the believing party, and the holiness of the children, are both derived from the believer*, so that your *fourth* argument seems, in my view, a flat contradiction to the Apostle’s assertion. Your positive declaration, therefore that the “holiness of the children is derived from that of the unbelieving parent,” I must consider as an unsupported position of a very extraordinary nature, yet on *this* position, unsupported as it is, you rest your “*plain proof that the holiness of the children is exactly of the same sort with that of the unconverted parent.*” It is worthy observation, that, the Apostle only says, concerning the parents, that *the unbeliever is sanctified by or to the believer*, whereas the children are  
not



not represented as *sanctified by or to their parents*, but, are pronounced *holy*, and, that in a manner which evidently distinguishes them, in some sense, from the children of unbelievers, who are termed *unclean*. The Apostle's words most plainly imply, that in consequence of one of the parents professing the christian faith, *their children are holy*, whereas, if both were unbelievers, *their children would be unclean*. This holiness therefore cannot mean *legitimacy*, for the children of unbelievers, legally married, are, every one knows, as *legitimate*, as those of the most eminent christians; nor can the holiness here mentioned, intend *an holiness of nature*, which gives the children of believers a pre-eminence to those of infidels. Accordingly it follows, that *the holiness intended by the Apostle* must be an *holiness of state*. This appears to me quite plain, from *the peculiar mode of expression*, adopted by the inspired writer on this occasion, and which in my opinion is well illustrated by Dr. Goodwin, in the following words\*, "The Apostle chooses to express the holiness of their state, thus with difference, in the same terms that the Old Testament useth of the children of the Jews in difference from the Heathen. Yea, and whereas, in propriety of speech, according to

\* Works, Vol. ii. page 405.

to the Greek, καθαρα *pure or clean*, answers to ἀκαθάρτα *unclean*, and so, in a right way of opposition to *unclean*, he should have said, *but now they are pure or undefiled*, we see that he varies it, and goes out of the road (as it were) of the Greek idiom and analogy, and says, *but now are they holy*, on purpose, because ἁγία and καθάρτα are used by the Septuagint, for things or persons that were *holy* and *unclean* among the Jews. And the Apostle here, on purpose, useth these very same expressions of difference of their children from others, by which the Jews expressed the difference between their children and the children of the Nations; and all to shew, that our privilege for our children holds and continues now as then; yea, that theirs was but the type of what is real now. The old Law in a typical sense, called things that were *unholy*, *unclean*, and persons prohibited to come into the temple, and to partake of holy things, were called *unclean*. But *the Seed of the Jews then admitted into the church*, were called *the holy Seed*, and that in distinction from the Gentiles."

Thus it appears, from the peculiar phraseology of the Apostle, that, when *the children* he mentions are termed *holy*, it denotes an holiness in themselves,

the  
from  
Co  
ter  
a f  
par  
nei  
san  
of J  
end  
a t  
thei  
the  
tha  
sign  
beli  
then

able  
nio  
mo  
pro  
par  
it  
wri

† F



themselves, i.e. an holiness of state, derived to them from the believing parent's Covenant, or that New Covenant in which the believing parent is interested, and that, therefore, their Holiness is a further holiness than that of the unbelieving parent. The state of the unbelieving parent neither is nor can be declared *holy*, but his being sanctified by or to the believer notes a passive kind of subserviency to the holy use of another, or to an holy end, whereas the children are pronounced *holy*; a term (as we have seen) directly expressive of their Separation to God in the visible Church, and so the use of it, in this passage, plainly intimates, that they were, and ought to be, baptized, as the sign of that separation, as well as to express their believing parents faith and hope in God as a God to them and their seed.

As a conclusion of my thoughts on this remarkable passage, I shall hold up to your view the opinion of Dr. Doddridge, on these words, "a little more of whose candour," you intimate\*, might be proper for me,—“On the maturest and most impartial consideration of this Text, I must judge it to refer to *Infant-Baptism*†.” Is this candid writer, Sir, to be numbered among those, ‡ “who”

D

you

\* *Observ. &c.* p. 33.

† *Family Expositor*, vol. 4, note (c) ‡ *Observ. &c.* p. 35°

you say, "IMPIOUSLY insist that when the Apostle said, 'Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy,' he signified, *that they had a right to baptism*." Some may presume to think, that "had you a little more of the good Doctor's candour," you would not have expressed yourself in this manner.

Leaving your personal Reflexions on me, whether expressed in *verse* or *prose*, for those readers, to whom such Embellishments may be pleasing, I here close my remarks on your *third Letter*,

and am,

S I R,

Yours, &c,

LETTER



## L E T T E R V.

REVEREND SIR,

**A**FTER introducing your *fourth Letter* with a remark, which perhaps may be thought no great honour to your Candor, you bring forward "Mark x. 13." affirming that it has no more "to do with infant-baptism," "than" Rev. ii. 17. *The hidden manna*; and Isaiah xlv. 15, *Verily thou art a God that hidest thyself, which*" words you assure your readers, "*Monsieur PASCAL* urges in support of *transubstantiation*\*." I am quite willing to submit what I have written on this passage, to the judgment of an impartial reader; only I must take leave to add, that I do not, in any degree, see the "weakness of my reasoning on this portion of Scripture," by what you have written concerning it. "Our Lord," you affirm†, "says not a

D 2

word

\* *Observ. &c.* p 38.—† p 39, &c.

word here about the little children of believers as *such*, but mentions little children indefinitely, or without distinction; therefore, the plea for the exclusive right of those of believers, can have no foundation in this place:—For another with equal propriety may hence draw the same inference in favour of *all* little children, or even of *those of unbelievers exclusively*,—"As a reply, I shall request your attention to the words of a certain writer, "By *such*, we must understand little ones, properly so called, *but not all such*; since the persons who brought these infants or little ones to *Christ*, were, without doubt, his followers, or such as had an high veneration for him. If they were not among his professed followers, they were *Jews*, not *Heathens*, and as *such*, at that time, members of the visible church\*."

You write here, that if infants have a right to Baptism, they "have a right also to the Lord's Supper†," but the cases do not appear to me parallel. We know that the proper subjects of the Lord's Supper must be able to *discern the Lord's Body*†, (i.e.) in some degree understand the design

\* A TREATISE ON the SUBJECTS and MODE of BAPTISM, &c. page 15. LONDON. 1742.

† *Observ. &c.* p. 40.—† 1 Cor. xi. 29.



design of the institution, whereas Baptism appertains to *all* such as belong to the church or kingdom of Christ, of which he has declared *the children of his people* are a part. "*Of such,*" says he, "*is the kingdom of God,*" and taking a child in his arms, his remarkable language was, "*whosoever shall receive one such little child, or this little child in my name, receiveth me ;*" and "*receiving any one in Christ's name,*" is, as he afterwards explains it, "*receiving him as belonging to him*.\*" After dismissing Mark x. 13. you proceed to let me know, that "*Isaiah xlv. 23. can be nothing to my purpose†,*" "*They are*" (says God himself, speaking concerning his elect‡) "*the seed of the blessed of the LORD, and their offspring with them.*" This noble declaration I still consider as a confirmation of the sentiment I maintain, that *the infant seed of believers in Gospel-times are blessed with their parents.* This passage, I perceive, you endeavour to turn off "to some future period of the church, of which we at present know but very little." But on comparing the chapter where this assurance stands, especially the concluding verse of it, with another part of this prophetic book§, the subject in both appears the same, especially, if it be considered,

D 3

sidered,

\* Mark ix. 37, 41. Luke ix. 48. + Observ. &c. p. 47.

‡ verse 22. —§ Chap. xi.

sidered, that, in the latter, it is expressly declared, the great things mentioned in this place should be, *when the Messiah was preached among the Gentiles.*\*

As I am attending to your *fourth Letter*, I think this a proper place in which to take notice of what you have advanced towards the conclusion of it†, respecting “baptism’s being substituted in the room of circumcision,” as well as your remarks on the same subject, near the end of your pamphlet‡. Our arguments do not oblige us to maintain, that the parallel between *these institutions* must hold in *all* particulars, but only in *such*, as evince, that there was nothing of *privilege* in circumcision of which the children of believers are now abridged§. To think, that because *circumcision* and *baptism* do not apply in *all* things, therefore they must apply in *none*, appears to me very absurd. Who will say, that the *Passover* and the *Lord’s Supper* correspond in every circumstance; and yet, the Apostle *Paul* plainly suggests the substitution of the latter upon the abolition of the former||? Your argument, that the substitution of baptism in the room of circumcision

\* verse 10.—† *Observ. Ec.* p. 51.—‡ p. 75. *Ec.*  
§ *Reviewer Reviewed, Ec.* p. 51—53.—|| 1 *Cor.* v. 7, 8.



circumcision cannot be scriptural, because *circumcision was practised after baptism was instituted*, is in my view of no force, since the *Jewish Church-state continued for a time, and while it remained, circumcision was to be practised*. Could you prove, indeed, that it was necessary to practise circumcision, after the Gospel-kingdom was established, that would be something to your purpose, but this, I presume, is beyond your line. Circumcision was only permitted to the Jews, as were many other rites, that had long obtained in the Old Testament Church, till the destruction of the Jewish Temple. — Women were not admitted to divine ordinances, during the former, but, they are, and must be, under the present, dispensation ; to say then, that baptism, which is to be administered to each sex, cannot succeed circumcision, because that could be administered to males only, is extremely futile. All were circumcised who became members of the Jewish Church, and were allowed to eat the Passover, and all are to be baptized, previous to their eating the Lord's Supper, from which females are no more excluded than males ; but it will not hence follow, that all who are baptized have an immediate right to the Lord's Supper, any more than it would, that all who were circumcised had an immediate right to eat the Passover.

Passover.—*Circumcision* was a service expressive of that purity which ought to distinguish a people separated to God, and so is *baptism*; in this the agreement is complete. The Old Testament Church State was a state of *bondage*, under *carnal ordinances*, the New Testament Church State is a State of freedom and spirituality. The rite by which members were admitted into the former, was wisely ordered to be someway expressive of the nature of the dispensation under which it was, as in many instances, *painful and irksome*, whereas the rite which our Lord Jesus, who has made his disciples free, has instituted, in the latter, is consonant to the more spiritual, glorious, and extensive, dispensation of the Gospel, wherein no distinction is made between *male* or *female*, nor any thing of bondage continued, but all is perfectly spiritual, sublime, and glorious. With these views, (which, I think, are scriptural,) let any one attend to the Apostle's reasoning, in his *Epistle* to the *Colossians*\*, and determine for himself, whether there be§ “not so much as the most distant hint” of the substitution for which I plead in Scripture; perhaps some may think there are much more than “distant hints” of it, notwithstanding “the clear and conclusive

\* Chap. ii.—§ *Observ. Ec. p. 51.*



conclusive reasons" (as you are pleased to call them) which you have brought to evince the contrary\*.—

The insinuations in various parts of your letters†, that my arguments, for the right of the infant-seed of believers to baptism, in consequence of their interest in the divine promise, amount TO CONFIDENCE IN THE FLESH, pleading for the right of the carnal seed of believers to spiritual privileges, with other charges of the same kind, are either entirely groundless, or, if they be of any force, must recoil upon yourself. You plead for the right of all infants to the kingdom of heaven, positively affirming, that "all who die in their infancy, the offspring of unbelievers as well as of believers, enter into bliss,"§ What I maintain is, that the infant seed of believers are to be treated as belonging to Christ, or as members of the Gospel-kingdom, with their parents, and as such to be baptized, and if taken away by death, in their infancy, my views of the promise, with the declaration of Christ concerning them, give me the fullest reason for believing, that they enter into bliss; but I no where say, that living to renounce the God of their fathers, their being descended from believing parents

\* Ibid—† P. 28, 43, 49, 50, 75, &c.— § P. 41.

parents secures their salvation. Whose arguments, then, your's or mine, have most *fleshly confidence* in them, let others judge. Where, I would ask, does the Holy Ghost apply the term *carnal seed* to the infants of believers; is not *carnal* always used to denote the character of Adults who live according to the desires of the flesh and of the mind? You are pleased to reflect on me\*, because I said†, that “the infants of believers are regenerated or born again,” but, Sir, is not this more proper than to call such a *carnal seed*? Our Lord's saying, *Except § tis (any one) be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God*, is a plain proof, that, in whatever sense we understand the kingdom of God here spoken of, infants, if they have a place in the Church of God, on earth, or in heaven, *must be born again*, i.e. *born of the cleansing Spirit*, the symbol of which is baptism; and though you will not allow them a place in the Church of God on earth, yet as you are not for keeping them out of heaven, *they must*, if they go there, according to this assertion of our divine Master, *be born again*.

When you say in a following part of your pamphlet§, speaking concerning “circumcision,”

“nor

\* P. 43. † Reviewer Reviewed, &c. p. 77. ‡ John iii. 3.

§ p. 74.

“nor,  
infants  
the w  
to it,  
and p  
infant  
it, wh  
the G  
what  
we all  
excuse  
or pr  
all wh  
circum  
not fa  
lievers  
know  
who p  
to the  
part\*,  
as suc  
tians  
you t  
there,  
cernin  
when



“nor, was the designation of this rite for the male infants of the *believing Jews only*, for those of the *wicked* of that nation had an equal right to it,” you ought to have explained yourself, and produced your proof. If you mean, that *all* infants descended from Abraham had a right to it, *whether their parents observed the institutions of the God of Israel or not*, you should tell us on what your faith in this respect is founded, that we also may see and believe; till then, you will excuse our withholding an assent to the justice or propriety of the remark. *The Infants of all who professed faith in the God of Israel* were circumcised, but certainly no others. We do not say, that baptism is for the infants of believers, *as such*, for *who they are*, is, with certainty, known to God only, but for the infants of those who *profess faith* in the Lord Jesus, and submit to the appointments of the Gospel. In a former part\*, you mention “the *carnal seed* of believers as such,” and a little after†, speaking of “*christians and their children, or infant offspring*,” you say,—“not the least hint is to be found there,” [in the Scriptures I had quoted] “concerning a *carnal seed*,” (as well there might not, when I never thought of applying *that term*  
to

\* P. 43.—† P. 48.

to infants,) “or,” you add, “concerning any seed at all.” *That* I must, Sir, take the liberty to deny. I refer to my pamphlet\* which gave occasion to your *Observations*. There it is plain the Scriptures I considered and compared were Gen. xvii. 7. Rom. xv. 8, 9, 10. and Gal. iii. 17. The Printer, indeed, by mistake, inserted Rom. xv. 8, 2, 10. *This* I think, a superficial reader might have observed, as I quoted part of the 8th and 9th verses, yet you transfer *this* mistake of the press into your *Observations*, as if Rom. xv. 8.—ii. 10. were the passages I was considering and comparing, though in the same page you allow “my main argument is—grounded on—Gen. xvii. 7. *I will be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee.*” I do not think this is treating me quite fairly, if you observed the typographical error, which possibly you might not advert to, and which I truly wish had never happened. But permit me to ask, Sir, on what ground do you call “the infant offspring of Christians, a carnal seed.” Does not the term “carnal,” as before remarked, always apply to “adults” only, “who live according to the desires of the flesh and of the mind,” and as such are denominated “carnal,” because they mind the things of the flesh.

Does

\* *Reviewer Reviewed*, &c. p. 80, &c.



Does the Scripture teach us to divide "the infant offspring of Christians" into their "*carnal*" and *spiritual* "*seed*?" This the distinction you make expressly requires : On what foundation do you support it? The Apostle\* calls *Abraham*, "*the Father of all them that believe*," whether they be Jews or Gentiles, and, in no one place, appears to me to insinuate, that the *adult* offspring of Christians, believing in the Lord, are *the spiritual seed of their pious parents*; this distinction, therefore, of "*the carnal*" and *spiritual* "*seed*" of Christians, is totally without foundation. The *infants* of believers were of old regarded as *the seed* of their parents, not only in a civil, but also in a religious sense, being admitted with their parents members of the church. When they became *adult*, they were treated with on their own personal profession, which entitled them to a continuance in the Church, and a farther right to privileges. In the Old Testament-times, *Males* only were admitted to Church-membership, but under the New Testament dispensation, our privileges are enlarged; for † "*in Christ Jesus*," under the Gospel Dispensation, "*there is neither male nor female*."

E

But,

\* *Rom. iv. 11.*—† *Gal. iii. 28.*

But, it seems, we must not argue, that *baptism* was substituted in the room of *circumcision*, because, you say, \* “it is not plainly revealed in Scripture.” We allow, this “substitution” *is not expressed in those very words*, yet, it appears to me, made known in the Scripture with sufficient clearness, and abundantly evinced by *arguments justly deducible from that inspired Volume*. Do you consider no article of truth or duty as *plainly revealed* in Scripture, unless you find it written there in *express words*? If so, to be consistent with yourself, you ought never to attempt an *Explanation*.

As to another particular you mention, to prove, that we are not to believe the substitution under consideration†, “that it would have been plainly declared by the Apostles when convened at Jerusalem,” on the occasion mentioned (“Acts xv.”) it appears to me totally inconclusive. To say, that “had baptism been substituted in the room of circumcision—it would have been plainly declared by the Apostles, &c.” is not to *argue from what has been written*, but to *prescribe what should have been written*. To which it may be added, that the business of that Council, was not merely (as you intimate) “to settle the dispute—respect-

\* *Observ. &c.* p. 51.—† *Ibid.*



ing the use or disuse of circumcision," but to determine, whether it was necessary that the Gentiles should "observe the whole ceremonial Law of Moses\*."

Having thus enquired whether the infants of believers, or of such as profess faith in Christ, are to be treated as belonging to the Church of God, and examined your reasons for thinking that *baptism* is not to be regarded as standing in the room of circumcision, I shall proceed to consider your *fifth letter*, after again assuring you, that

*I am,*

**S I R,**

*Yours, &c.*

**E 2**

**LETTER**

\* Acts xv. 24.—See *Reviewer Reviewed*, p. 84. n.†

## L E T T E R VI.

REVEREND SIR,

**A**CCORDING to the promise already made at the end of my *last*, I address myself to that view of the *Ancients*, which you have thought fit to give in your *fifth letter*; as to which, I must freely acknowledge, what you have written has not in the least altered my sentiments concerning their practice. The passages I had introduced strike my mind as they before did, and I flatter myself, others will be of the same opinion, on an impartial attention to what each of us has said on the subject\*.

To begin with "*Justin Martyr*," with whose "*testimony*" you begin. This writer, you alledge,

\* The reader is requested if he would peruse the passages of the ancient writers, afterwards mentioned, to turn to *Reviewer Reviewed*, &c. page 91, &c. where he will see whence the following quotations were chiefly extracted.



alledge, \**“says,”* those whom he represents as the subjects of baptism, are *‘per uaded, and do believe,* that those things which are taught and spoken by us are true, and engage to live accordingly,’ and adds—*‘since we were born at first without our knowledge, by necessity,—and brought up in wicked customs, we should not continue children of necessity and ignorance, but of choice and knowledge.’* “What does *this* evince, but *that* which we allow? We readily grant, that, the primitive Christians were careful as to the characters of those *Adults* whom they admitted to baptism. They compelled none of the Emperor’s subjects to renounce the religion of the empire, but, if any were convinced, by the preaching of the Gospel, and *‘of choice and knowledge,’* desired Christian Baptism, it was administered to them, and as we believe, to *their children also*, for they had (to use *Justin’s* own words,) *“those amongst them, who were disciplined to Christ in their childhood.”* That this is the true sense of *Justin’s* words, appears to me undeniably evident, notwithstanding your criticism on the original, οἱ ἐκ παιδὸς ἐμαθόντες τοῦ Χριστοῦ, which, you say, † *“ought to be translated, who were taught or instructed in Christ from their childhood; just as Timothy is*

E 3

said

\* *Observ. Ec. p. 56.* † *Ibid p. 58. Ec.*

said to have known the holy Scriptures from a child, 2 Tim. iii. 15." I am, Sir, permit me to say, much surprized at your offering *this passage* in support of your criticism. What similarity is there between Justin's saying, *οι εκ παιδων μαθητευθησαν τω Χριστω*, who from their childhood were discipled to Christ, and the Apostle Paul's declaring to Timothy, *απο βρεφους τα ιερα γραμματα οιδες*, from a child thou hast known the holy Scriptures? Could you find nothing better to justify your translation of Justin's words, than this declaration of the Apostle, which, in the Greek, is totally different? Why not bring forward some *Rule of Grammar*, or some *parallel Place*, whereby your version of the passage might be vindicated? However, as nothing of *this kind* is introduced by you, I shall take the liberty to introduce a quotation in direct opposition to your critical Remark. Plutarch says, \* "*Antiphon the son of Sophilus, μαθητευσας δε τω πατρι*, having been discipled or a disciple to his father," but according to your construction of "*Justin*" we should read it, "*Antiphon having been instructed in his Father.*" Immediately on this criticism, you ask—"But what Man in his senses will from hence conclude, that infants in Justin's time were baptized?" To which question, was I disposed to imitate your manner of expression, I might

\* *De vit. Licet. Rhet. Op. vol. 2, pag. 832.*



I might answer, "Any man in his senses would think so;" for, though (to use the words of a learned writer\*) "Dr. Gale brings a great many instances, where a course of *Learning, Teaching, Studying, &c.* is said to have been from childhood, there is not among them, nor I believe any where else, an instance of any one that has been said to be μαθητης, or μαθητευθης, [a disciple or discipled] to Christ in, or from childhood, except he were baptized then."

"*Irenæus*" is the next ancient writer whom you hold up to your reader, let us, therefore, attend to him.—To his "testimony" you make many objections, any of which, if duly supported, would, I own, go a considerable way towards turning aside the passage quoted from him, so as that it would not answer the end for which I produced it. You first insinuate a doubt whether the passage be genuine.† "The testimony of *Irenæus*," you say, "if it be his," and having introduced some circumstances which you think suited to confirm *this insinuation*, you add,§ "these things, Sir, properly considered, are enough to convince any impartial man, that it was none of the fathers of the second century that did write

\* *Wall's Defence, &c.* page 280.

† *Observ. &c.* p. 59.—§ P. 62

write this disputable passage; much less to a learned, well-informed, and venerable, a Father as *Irenæus*.”—“ Supposing this passage to be genuine,” you say†,—“ it will be in the first place necessary to prove, that by *born again*, or *regenerated*, is meant *baptized*, which yet some learned men of the first rank deny, and affirm that that manner of speaking did not obtain as early as *Irenæus*’s time,” in proof of which, at the foot of the page, you refer your readers to the Drs. *Gale* and *Gill*. I thought, Sir, you told us a page or two before†, when you quoted *Iustin*’s words, (who, according to your own account\*, “ flourished thirty or forty years before *Irenæus*”) that, speaking concerning persons who were baptized, he said,—“ they are then led by us to a Place where there is water, and they are regenerated with the same kind of regeneration with which we were regenerated,” yet now you intimate, that “it is necessary to prove, that” *that mode of expression, which your own words declare obtained in Iustin*’s time, prevailed so early as “*Irenæus*”, who you assure us “flourished about thirty or forty years after him.”

Here it is necessary to “bring forward the testimony of *Irenæus*,” (though I have done it already

† P. 60, 61.—† p. 57.—\* p. 56.



already\*) that the reader may judge of the following remarks. "He" ["Christ"] came to save all persons, by himself, all I mean who by him are regenerated," [i.e. baptized] "unto God, Infants, and little ones, and children, and youths, and elder persons."—That, as you say†, "it is exceedingly probable, that in the above passage, the word *infantes*" [*infants*] "is used rather in a proper than a vulgar sense," is an argument, the weakness of which must, I think, be evident to any one who observes, that *Irenæus* distinguishes "*infants*" from "*little ones* and *children*." And "in reading *Irenæus*," says Dr. Wall, § "I have minded that in several places (in all where I can find the word) he takes the word *infant* in the same sense as we and all others do."—And it is very clear even from your own quotation‡, that the word "*infant*" is used by *Irenæus*, in the common sense of that word; for in reference to every other age, Christ, he says, was "*an example*," but in regard to "*infants*," he does not use *that expression*; his words are, "*being an infant among the infants, sanctifying infants*."—Thus, I think, you, Sir, have made it clear, that the term "*regenerated*" obtained as early as the time of "*Irenæus*,"

\* *Reviewer Reviewed*, &c. p. 96. † *Observ.* &c. p. 61.

§ *Defence*, &c. p. 353.—‡ *Observ.* &c. p. 60

*næus*," since *Justin* who lived before him used it; and that the word "*infantes*" [*infants*] does apply to such as were not capable of imitating Christ's "example." To what purpose then is it in this case to cite "*Hippocrates*," "*Danet*," and "the *Laws of England*?"\*

But you introduce some considerations, which you think altogether invalidate the passage, I would, therefore, for a moment attend to them. The whole weight of your objection rests on *Irenæus*'s mistake in a *chronological point*, and even in that, you seem to have fixed a meaning to his words beyond what they naturally imply. You insinuate†, that *Irenæus* maintained that our Saviour "lived to be an old man," whereas, the utmost he says is, that our Lord had the age of an elder, when he taught, which age commences, according to his own words, at the *fortieth year*. His words are "*from the fortieth and fiftieth it declines to ELDER AGE, WHICH OUR LORD HAD WHEN HE TAUGHT§.*" The learned *Petavius* acknowledges *this* to be a mistake, yet shews, that there is nothing in which *Irenæus* can be said to contradict himself. The venerable Father owns *Christ* to have been at his *baptism about thirty years of age*,  
and

\* P. 61.—† p. 62.—§ p. 60.



and quotes the mention of *three passovers* after that, which was enough to confute the opinion of his living but one year after, as the *Valentinians*, whom he was opposing, maintained, but he imagined, that, *Christ* staid full ten years after his baptism, before he entered on his public ministry; for he says, "He was thirty years old, when he came to baptism." Then afterward, when he had the complete age of a master or teacher (which in the same chapter he defines to be forty) he came to *Jerusalem*. Now, that first going to *Jerusalem* was at, or presently after, the beginning of his preaching, John ii. 13. And, wherein is it wonderful, that *Irenæus* should suppose our Lord waited some years after his baptism before he began to preach?—The great *Usher* was of the same opinion, only, with this exception, that he supposed *three years and an half* elapsed from his baptism to the beginning of his preaching, and *Irenæus* thought there were *ten*. But, what is this to the authenticity of the passage? Must a person be perfect in chronological calculations before his writings on theological subjects can deserve credit; or, must it be proved, that *Irenæus* erred in nothing, before we listen to his testimony in any thing? If he was mistaken with respect to the number of years our Lord lived

*on earth* (which was not at all surprising), is it reasonable to reject *all he writes*, or, which, in the present case, is the same thing, *all that we maintain he did write, in this Chapter, as spurious?* Till you can find some better reason for rejecting *this passage* than the *chronological error* on which you have commented, we have as much ground to deem it *authentic*, and to conclude that *Irenæus* was "the author" of it, as we either want or wish to have, in support of the cause for which it is produced.

"*Origen's testimony*," which next presents itself in your *Observations\**, is so plain, and full, that to evade it in the manner you have attempted, shews, that you are not a little pinched with the conclusion that must naturally follow. If there was not such a thing as infant baptism in the world the first hundred years after the Apostles, as *you affirm*, and yet *Origen* speaks of it as the practice of the church, about ten years after, no one can suppose the former assertion is founded in fact. Should it be allowed that *Ruffinus* used freedom in translating *Origen*, with a view to clear him from some things alledged against him, *that* is nothing to the purpose, respecting the subject of the present controversy,

\* Page 63.



controversy, for *Jerome*, who was a bitter enemy to *Ruffinus*, and who also translated *Origen*, perfectly agrees with him, in giving the sense of *Origen*, concerning the *point in question*. Your saying to me\*,—"the passages you have quoted bear a much greater resemblance to the writings of that time," ["about the latter part of the fourth century," when, you say, "the translator *Ruffinus* lived"] "than to those of above an hundred years before, when *Origen* lived," will never carry conviction to considerate readers, till you shall be pleased to state the great difference between the language of *Origen's* age, and that of *Jerome's*, as to the case now debated: Till that be done, your assertion, that this "testimony of *Origen*—is of no weight at all," will hardly pass for an answer, even with the addition of all you have advanced besides on that head†. And, here, Sir, I must be so free as to tell you, that *this* method of clearing away testimonies that witness against you, reminds me of what a certain person once said to his antagonist, (as Dr. *Wall* relates it§) "It is your common method to evade the authority of the fathers, by saying, they

F

are

\* *Ibid.*—† *Ibid.*—§ *Defence, &c.* page 317.

are but translations, &c. But you have neither originals nor translations of those early times, on your side. Were there no *Antipædo-baptists* then to translate?" I apprehend it was even so; as I do not think there was one of that character in the church of Christ at that time.

After saying, that "you think you have made it very clear, that my testimonies of the ancients will in no wise serve my cause, or disserve yours," you "observe, that it is not a sentiment peculiar to the Baptists, that infant-baptism was unknown to the christians of the two first ages," adding—"some very eminent *Pædobaptists* are of the same opinion." You mention *two instances* in support of this assertion, "*Curcellæus*" and "*Suicerus*\*." To what *Curcellæus* advances no reply seems necessary, as it is evident to me, you do not believe what he has affirmed.—He says "in the third and fourth" ["ages after Christ,"] "it" ["infant baptism"] was approved by a few—but you "freely acknowledge" and "allow§, that the sense and practice of numbers," even "great numbers" "of those of the third and following ages were

\* P. 62, &c. where whoever pleases may see the Words of these Authors.—§ Compare Review, &c. page 44, and Observ. &c. p. 54, &c.



were in favour of my sentiments." After such Authority, Sir, do you wish me to pay any regard to "*Curcellæus*?" To this writer's saying, in the close of the passage just referred to, that *infant baptism* "is observed by us, as an ancient custom, but not as an apostolical tradition," I reply in the words of the celebrated *Witsius*\*,—"The Grounds for infant-baptism, and§ those more solid than any which can be alledged to the contrary, are to be met with in the Scriptures, so that there is no necessity, with the *papists*, who shamefully prevaricate in a good cause, to have recourse in this matter to unwritten tradition;" and, for *Protestants*, to argue, as "*Curcellæus*" does, that the foundation of their practice rests on the custom of those periods of the church which gave birth to so many absurd rites, as it is well known rose "in the *fifth and following ages*," till which time he would have us believe "*it was approved*" only "*by a few*," is surely to take most wretched ground. We leave him, therefore, I trust, without much company, to lay his foundation on a quagmire, while we are ambitious to build on that sure and

F 2                      unshaken

\* *Oeconomia Fæderum*, &c. lib. iv. cap. 16, sec. 40.

§ The elegant *Author's* words are "*omni exceptione firmiora,—so firm as to be above all exception.*"

unshaken rock, the Word of God.—The other *Pædobaptist* you mention is “*Suicerus*.” He declares “that in the two first ages no one received baptism, but he who, having been instructed in the faith, and imbued with the doctrine of Christ, was able to testify that he believed.”—This may be true in a limited sense, or, as importing the care and attention that was paid not to baptize any ignorant adult persons, but if he means, as his words seem to imply, that no infant was baptized, I am by no means disposed to regard his mere assertion, in contradiction to all the Christian World, a few *Antipædobaptists* alone excepted.—As you have recommended me to “*Garcellæus*” and “*Suicerus*,” let me request your attention to what that great reformer Mr. *Calvin*, (to whom you give an honourable character, in the very pamphlet which gave rise to these Remarks\*) writes on this head §. Speaking of some, who, in his time, endeavoured to persuade the plain common people, that *infant-baptism* was unknown for many years after the resurrection of Christ, his words are,—“In this they most grossly falsify, since there is no ancient writer who does not, for certain, refer its origin to the apostolic age.”

As

\* P. 42.—§ *Instit. lib. iv. cap. 16. sec. 8.*



As to the "change," which you observe\* "took place" in "the Church of England," where, as you say, "in the course of about fifty years, immersion was wholly laid aside, and sprinkling substituted in its room," it may be remarked, *this* hath no tendency to prove, as you insinuate it has, that, in *the ancient Church*, there was a "change of the subjects of baptism from adults to infants," so as that, if no such thing as infant-baptism obtained, in all the world, in the second century, as you affirm, it should nevertheless become "the sense and practice of great numbers," which we have already seen you "allow" and "freely acknowledge," or as *Origen*, who (to use your own words†) "flourished, in the former part of the third century," speaks, the usage of the church in his time. And as to *the substitution of "sprinkling" or pouring, in the room of "immersion,"* *this* took place *after the Reformation from Popery*, when it is to be hoped, the rulers of the Church, and the teachers of the people, became better acquainted with their Bibles, than in the days of darkness which preceded that memorable and glorious event.—I might here, Sir, put a period to my Remarks on your *fifth Letter*, but I must briefly take notice of a passage§ that contains

\* *Observ. Eccl.* p. 63.—† p. 55.—§ p. 59.

contains an heavy charge against me, which you have advanced in it. You represent me as having expressed myself concerning you in language, “the plain English of which is, *What he has insinuated is a positive and wilful falsehood.*” I hope, the Reader will consider *this*, not as *my meaning*, but *your interpretation*. In my former Pamphlet\* I said, speaking of you—“he insinuates that I had so stated the case,” [i. e. respecting *circumcision* as mentioned in my *strictures*,†] “as that it was no objection of theirs; but herein he knew better”—and in proof of this last assertion, with which I perceive you are offended, I referred you to *your own words*§, and to *them* I still appeal, in justification of what I alledged.

With this necessary vindication of myself from a want of “that propriety and delicacy of behaviour,” which you say “some people seem so much to value themselves for,” I take my leave of your *fifth Letter*, and am,

S I R,

*Yours, &c.*

LETTER

\* *Reviewer Reviewed*, &c. page 85—† P. 9, &c.

§ *Review*, &c. p. 24, &c.



---



---

## L E T T E R VII.

REVEREND SIR,

**Y**OUR *sixth and last letter* is now before me. The *first* part of it chiefly relates to “the argument for infant sprinkling” [Baptism] “founded on the Scripture-account of the baptizing of *households*,” which you say “requires but a short answer;” to *this*, therefore, I shall *first* attend. You charge me with “an undoubted and unpardonable breach of the law of disputation.” Why so? I have, you say, “put an opponent upon proving a *negative*.” Heinous Crime! How is so dreadful a charge supported? I said, which you wittily call\* “the drollest part of my whole story, about those households” spoken of in Scripture as baptized, “Whereas we read of believers and — ‘their *households* baptized, it concerns *our opponents* to PROVE THAT THERE WAS NOT one *infant* in such

\**Observ. &c.* p. 65.

fuch families.'—"And Sir, have not the *Antipædo-*  
*baptists* often attempted *this*, and, does not *this*  
 evince, that even *they* thought *this* a matter which  
 concerned them and their cause? *This* you know  
 Mr. *Wilson* attempted; and, notwithstanding all  
~~which he, you, or any of your persuasion, whose writings~~  
*I have met with*, have alledged on *this* head, I still  
 think, it is perfectly right to demand of you, and  
 others of your mind, a *clear and unequivocal proof*,  
 that *there was not one infant, no, not one little child*  
*in such households.*

But, from your *accusation* I proceed to your *ar-*  
*guments.* You say, (for though you chiefly use  
*the words of another writer*†, since you quote them  
 as expressing your sentiments, I may justly consider,  
 represent, and treat them, as *your own*,) "the  
 Scripture sometimes mentions *all the house*, when  
 only the adult part of it is intended." *This*  
 plea, Sir, will not in the least help the cause you  
 espouse, since, when *that* is the case, the expres-  
 sion "*all the house*," is manifestly to be under-  
 stood of *those only who were capable of performing in*  
*their own persons the actions said to be done by all the*  
*house.*

† *Maclea*n against *Huddleston*, &c. p. 20.



house. So it certainly was in the *first* instance mentioned to support the criticism; yourself being judge; "*ALL the house of Millo gathered together and made Abimelech king; (Judges ix. 6.)* yet," you immediately add, "none will affirm that infants had any hand in this." And does not *this*, Sir, let light on *the other instances* you see fit to introduce?—As to "*Cornelius,*" "*the Jailer,*" and "*Crispus,*" you can no more prove, from what is said respecting them, that *there were no children in their families*, than you can demonstrate, that there were no infants in "*the house of Millo,*" since the term *ALL*, as to *that house*, will, according to your own interpretation, apply to those alone who "*had an hand in making Abimelech king.*" What! though it be said, "*Cornelius feared God with all his house,*" (Acts x. 2.) may not this term "*ALL his house,*" be understood *only of such as were capable of performing those actions which were expressive of the fear of God?* When it is affirmed, as to "*the Jailer,*" that "*they*" [ "*Paul and Silas*" ] "*spake unto him the word of the Lord and to all that were in his house,*" (chap. xvi. 32.) and that "*He rejoiced, believing in God, with ALL his house,*" (ver. 34.) can the expression "*ALL his house*" be justly applied to any in that family, but *such as were able to hear*  
*the*

*the word of the Lord, and to rejoice, believing in God?* And so, when, concerning "*Crispus*," it is affirmed, that "*He believed on the Lord with ALL his house*," (chap. xviii. 8.) can this large phrase "*ALL his house*," be extended to any under this good man's roof but *those who were capable of believing on the Lord?* By what rules of just and fair interpretation, Sir, can you prove, that, *the same mode of expression*, which you explain in *one sense* when used of "*the house of Millo*," must be represented in a different point of view when applied to the "*houses of Cornelius, the Jailor, and Crispus*;" if in the *former*, it can be referred only to those who *had an hand in making Abimelech king*, why, in the *latter*, must it be stretched any further than to *such as were capable of HEARING, BELIEVING, and REJOICING?*—You add\*, "*If they*"["*infants*"] "*cannot be included in the ALL who believed, &c.* neither can they be included in the ALL who were baptized." But is not *this*, Sir, what *Logicians* call *petitio principii*, i. e. *begging the question*, or, taking for granted the point in debate?

As to the remarks on the Greek word "*πανοικι*," [*panoiki*] *with all his house*, which are brought forward



forward in this part of your pamphlet, how little support *they* give to the cause you attempt to defend, appears to me, from the preceding *observations*; nor do I think Mr. Glas's criticism in the least enervated by any thing here offered against it.

The account of "*Lydia*" you pass over with the mere mention of *this* one remark\*, "the sacred oracles no where say that there were infants in *Lydia's household*," but (to use your own words,) "you know, Sir, and all the world knows, that the sacred oracles"—say, that—"she was baptised, and her household," without inserting even one word about any in that household believing but herself, or making in their own persons a profession of christianity.

You seem much displeased at my remarks on the account which the Scripture gives of the households there represented as baptised, especially that of the Tailor, and intimate, that I have advanced what amounts, in your opinion, to contradicting the words of the Holy Ghost himself.

'Your remarks,' you say†, (referring me to the writer ‡ whose language, as has been already observed,

you

\* P. 64.—† p. 66.—‡ Mr. Maclean.

*you have chiefly made use of, on this part of the subject)* “on the scripture account of those households, especially that of the Jailor, remind me of the observations of a writer already named, upon the manner in which this argument has been handled by some of your brethren. ‘Others,’ says he, ‘convinced that no argument for infant-baptism can be drawn from those houses, whilst some stubborn texts stand in the way, have fallen to work, as with hammers and axes, to cut them down’—”. *This* is, indeed, a very severe insinuation, on “some of my” [pædobaptist] “brethren,” while your assuring me, that “*my remarks remind you of his observations,*” points the reflection *personally at myself*; and to support it, “Mess. *Huddleston and Glas*” are introduced.

*The first* of these Gentlemen, I must take the liberty to say, is grossly misrepresented. As an evidence that he is so, I shall *first* present to my reader the words brought into your *Observations*\*, and *then* set before him, what Mr. *Huddleston* has *really* advanced. “The sacred historian,” says the writer whom you quote, “tells us, that Cornelius was *a devout man, and one that feared God, WITH ALL HIS HOUSE* (Acts x. 2.) Not so, says Mr. *Huddleston*, none in Cornelius’s house feared God but himself. † Of the same house  
of

\* *Ibid.*—† *Huddleston’s Letters*, p. 54.



of Cornelius, together with some of his kinsmen, it is written, 'The HOLY GHOST fell on all them which HEARD the word,' verse 44. and Peter says, God purified their hearts by FAITH, chap. xv. 9. But the above writer tells us, that "the account of the house of Cornelius hearing, believing, or receiving the Holy Ghost, is not true, and that it cannot be affirmed in the fear of God, that he had any house else but little children\*.' Of the Jailor and his house, it is also written, that Paul and Silas 'spake unto him the word of the Lord, AND TO ALL THAT WERE IN HIS HOUSE,' chap. xvi. 32. This he likewise treats as a falshood, and denies that 'Paul and Silas had any other hearer from the Jailor's house besides himself†'—". *Such*, Sir, is the account the writer you quote with approbation produces of Mr. *Huddleston's* arguments, but, before the reader makes a judgment, I must desire him to hear Mr. *Huddleston's* own words. After reprovng his opponent‡, the very writer, Sir, on whose words introduced into your *observations* I have just been remarking, for unfair treatment of Mr. *Glas* against whom he wrote, and observing, that "he considers the house of Cor-

G

nelius

\* P. 22.—† p. 56.—‡ p. 53, 54.

nelius as including *his kinsmen and near friends*," complaining of it, as not "a fair representation of this transaction," he adds—"in Acts chap. x. I find no hint of the house of Cornelius *bearing, believing, or receiving the Holy Ghost*. It is said verse 2. that he *feared God with all his house*, which may, without any violence done to the words, signify his maintaining the fear of God in his house, in his prayers and good works. But let us suppose, that *all his house* in this text designs persons capable of doing those works which bespeak the fear of God, and that, because of infants being incapable of those works (which is all the reason that can be assigned) they are not included in those words, *all his house*; yet this reason cannot have any place for excluding infants in chap. xi. 14. where it is said, that he and all his house should be saved by the word to be spoken to him; for if he had infants to be excluded in the former text, because of their incapacity to fear God, yet they were as capable as he, or any that could be in his house, of being saved, and therefore cannot be excluded here on such an account. And if we insist from chap. x. 2. that he had none other in his house but such as were capable of fearing God, the text will not support such a sense—it gives no countenance to it. If in common discourse,



course, at this day, we should hear it said of any person, that he is one that fears God with all his house; it would never enter into our heads that such a person had no little children: The utmost we could suppose would be, that those of his family come to understanding were religiously disposed after his example." In a former part of *his letters*\*, he writes, "When the Apostle Peter was sent to open this kingdom or the door of faith to the Gentiles, he spake the same things to them as he had to the Jews. He told Cornelius words whereby he and *all his house* should be saved, Acts xi. 14. If this text speaks to our understanding it connects the *house* of Cornelius with himself in that salvation brought by the words spoken to *him*. In the words of the angel to Cornelius the same thing is intended by the term *house* that was intended by the term *children* in Peter's words to the Jews; for as he then connected the receivers of his word and their children in the promise unto which they were baptized, so is this Gentile and his house connected in the salvation brought by the words he received. And whatever other house he might have besides *little children* they cannot be included in this connection; though indeed, from what is said of him and his house,

\* P. 22.

house, it cannot be affirmed in the fear of God, that he had any house else but little children. We have\* indeed very confidently asserted it, from chap. x. 2. because it is there said of him, that *he feared God with all his house*. But this is not a sufficient foundation for us to be assured that any one of these ALL prayed to God, gave alms, &c. as did Cornelius himself, though it may assure us that he had respect to all these in his prayers and almsdeeds, and that he was setting the fear of God before all, as they should come to understanding. Accordingly there is no notice taken of any prayers and almsdeeds in his house besides his own, verse 4, 30, 31. nor is any mention made of any in his house to receive instruction

\* It is necessary here to observe, that, Mr. Huddleston had been an *Antipædobaptist Minister*, at *Whitehaven*, in *Cumberland*, but on conviction that *Infant-baptism was of divine authority*, he renounced his former principles, and in the year 1769, published to the world his reasons for the change in his sentiments and practice. *The brethren with whom he was connected, seeing their former opinion and conduct indefensible, acknowledged their error, and all the members of his church (two only excepted) came over to the Pædobaptists.* See *his Letters*, p. 1—The Reader will therefore be pleased to consider him as here referring to his, and his brethren's sentiments, while they were *Antipædobaptists*.



struction from Peter besides himself, ver. 6, 31. nor *U. 33.* is any notice taken of his house, in calling together his kinsmen and near friends, on Peter's coming, verse 24, 33."—Such is Mr. *Huddleston's* own account of this matter, and I am much mistaken, Sir, if, after you have duly attended to it, your own conscience will not accuse you of *gross misrepresentation*. As to "*the Jailer*," the same writer has the following remarks. Addressing his opponent, he says\*, "1. Try if it can fairly appear to you, from any thing said in the whole narration, that Paul and Silas had any other hearer from the Jailer's house besides himself; and if the 'apostle's answer to the jailer's' question, first more briefly and comprehensively, verse 31. and then verse 32. more fully and particularly, is not all one discourse, without any intermission of speaking the word of the Lord to him and his house. 2. Can you doubt of what is said verse 31. being addressed to the jailer *only*? And was not salvation even in the words of this verse preached to his house as much as to himself? Yea as clearly was salvation preached to his house, in that comprehensive answer to his question, as in the after enlargement on it, verse 32. 3. If no more was intended than 'that his house would be

\* p. 56.

be saved as well as he, believing on Christ,' what propriety can we see in this connection, which the apostle's words signify, between him and his house? If this had been all, as *Glas* observes, 'then it might as well have been said, thou shalt be saved and all the houses in Philippi, or the whole world'—." Now, Sir, if these sentences did not escape you, as I presume they did not, must it not appear very strange, to every impartial and dispassionate man, that you should permit\* the following passages to appear in your pamphlet, from the writer you quote, *uncensored*, "Of the jailor and his house it is written, that Paul and Silas 'spake unto him the word of the Lord, AND TO ALL THAT WERE IN HIS HOUSE,' chap. xvi. 32. This he," [Mr. *Huddleston*] "likewise treats as a falshood, and denies that 'Paul and Silas had any other hearer from the Jailer's house besides himself'—". The truth is, "Mr. *Huddleston*," understands the sacred historian's words in a different light from *that* in which you and your friends view it, and he gives his reasons for taking them in that sense, but, is *that* a sufficient cause for thinking or saying, that, "*He treats*" the Scripture narration "*as a falshood?*"

And

\* *Observ. &c.* p. 67.



And, Sir, why was *this* introduced in your *Letters* to me? Had I mentioned "Mr. Huddleston," or used *his* arguments on *this* passage? You know I had not, nor am I concerned in any thing he has advanced, so as to be under a necessity of maintaining *all* that he asserts as his opinion. But I thought it a piece of justice, in compliance with that golden rule, of *doing to others as we would they should do unto us*, to state the account fairly, that he might not be represented in a wrong light.

As "Mr. Huddleston" has been misrepresented, Mr. Glas has been treated with the same injustice. To prove *this* I shall produce the account given in your pamphlet\*, and then bring forward *his* own words. The writer you still quote says, "We are further told, that the jailer rejoiced, believing in God, WITH ALL HIS HOUSE verse 34. But Mr. Glas assures us there was no such thing; that none in the jailer's house believed but himself, and that his rejoicing was not in God, but in the whole house." Thus, Sir, it is affirmed by the author you have introduced. Mr. Glas's own words, more fully stated, are these†,—"It is said, (verse 34.) that he believed, and

\* Ibid.—† NOTES ON SCRIPTURE TEXTS, No. iii. See his WORKS, v. 2. p. 129. Edin. 1761.

and there is no mention of any other believing but himself. The text says, 'that he believing God, *ὑπαλαμυσας παντα rejoiced in the whole house,*' as Rom. xii. 12. *τη ἐλπίδι χαριούμεν; rejoicing in hope.* This joy is his who 'fell down before Paul and Silas, and brought them out' of 'the Stocks' in 'the inner prison,' 'and said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved?' Who 'took them,—and washed their stripes;' and having 'brought them into his house,' set a table before them. It was he that '*rejoiced, believing in God.*' And certainly it was matter of the greatest joy to him, who had just before been thinking of nothing but the ruin of himself and family, to *find eternal salvation, in the Lord Jesus, not only to himself, but all his house.*" These being "Mr. Glas's" own words, must it not be astonishing to every dispassionate man, to find it asserted, that, "Mr. Glas assures us, that his" [the jailer's] "rejoicing was not in God?" In a former part of your pamphlet\*, you represent me as "perverting the truth." An heavy charge, for which I cannot find the least ground, except my *differing from you in sentiment, on the point of baptism*, be thought sufficient to confirm it. In another page†, you seem very angry, because I

happened

\* *Observ. &c.* p 10.—† p. 44.



happened to say in my former pamphlet, speaking of you\*, "Our antagonist, it seems, is a very warm opposer of the doctrine of inference and analogy," (referring for proof to your own *Review*, &c.†) "and we need not wonder at it, the reason is plain. His cause in this matter requires it." But, permit me to ask, Sir, do not you make use of "*inference and analogy*," when you think it requisite to support your cause in that way? And why must *that* be unlawful and censurable on one side, which is practised as lawful and commendable on the other?—What seems particularly to offend you, is, the reason I gave why I think you "are a warm opposer of inference and analogy," because I add, "your cause requires it." This you declare§, is "as much as to say, 'It is *not*—because he *really* or *conscientiously* thinks inferencial and analogical reasoning *insufficient* to support a *positive* duty, that he opposes it—Honesty and Conscience are out of the question'—". If you *will* interpret my words thus, I cannot help it: I assure you I had not the *least* intention to insinuate any such charge as *this* against you. But, ~~the~~ the merit of your conduct, in the instances adduced, I leave to the decision of the candid reader.

I shall

\* *Reviewer Reviewed*, &c. p. 57. † p. 28, &c.

§ *Observer*, &c. p. 45.

*\* Cystid a Dewi i d mris wryfoll yn  
an foddlon i'r dardlenydd ei ddyn all felly.*

I shall now, Sir, advert to some other particulars in your *last Letter*, to which I am at present more immediately attending, of which it may be proper to take some notice. I perceive you kindly tell me\* “that it is not quite safe, even under the Gospel dispensation, to play and trifle with divine ceremonies.” With “*divine ceremonies*” I hope I shall never “trifle,” and if you charge me with *this*, because I will not give *your baptism* that name, to the exclusion of *sprinkling* or *pouring* as the mode, and of *infants* as the subjects, I cannot help it. You write†—“that circumcision was a *seal of the covenant of grace*, (as you plead‡) or, indeed of any other covenant, the Scripture nowhere tells me; therefore I *neither know nor believe any such thing*.” What is the import of the following passages of Scripture compared together I should be glad you would be pleased to inform me. “And he” [“God”] “gave him” [“Abraham”] “the covenant of circumcision§.” “And he” [“Abraham”] “received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of faith||.” And ye” [“thou Abraham and thy seed”] “shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin, and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you.”

\* P. 71.—† p. 69.—‡ *Reviewer Reviewed*, p. 120. 121, &c.—§ *Acts* vii. 8. || *Rom.* iv. 11.



you\*." In *these texts*, Sir, are not the words "sign," "seal," "token," used as synonymous or convertible terms? The candid Dr. *Doddridge* most undoubtedly thought so, when he thus expressed his mind on one of the passages I have just mentioned†. "*Seal of the Righteousness of faith,*"] This seems an uncontestable proof, that circumcision was a *seal of the covenant of grace*, and not merely of *temporal promises*; and consequently obviates the most considerable objection that hath ever been urged against *infant-baptism*." If you will not allow, that *these* are terms of the same import, and which may therefore be warrantably used one for the other, I call upon you, Sir, clearly to state *the difference between them*, that I may be enabled hereafter to represent, with precision, the meaning of "a sign," "a seal," and "a token," plainly shewing how, and in what, each differs from the other. The very learned Mr. *Poole*‡, speaking of "*circumcision*," after expressly asserting that it "was given that it might be a sign," and pointing out the different reasons for which it may be considered as such, from various authors, introduces the following  
remark

\* Gen. xvii. 11.—† Note (g) on Rom. iv. 11. *Family Expositor*. v. 4. p. 53.—‡ *Syn. Crit.* in Gen. xvii. 11. é *Lightfooti. op.* vol. i. p. 13. *Roterodi.* 1687.

remark of the justly celebrated "*Dr. Lightfoot.*"—  
 "Circumcision was instituted in *Hebron*, in  
 the month *Abib* or *Nisan*," [*March* or *April*]  
 "in which place, and at which time of the  
 year, *John the Baptist* was born, who sub-  
 stituted *Baptism* in the room of *circumcision.*"  
 Respecting "the six things I offered to your  
 consideration†," you write‡, "I cannot but think  
 that I have had the honour of considering them  
 before you took upon you to do so." If *this* was  
 the case—your answers do not appear to me to  
 indicate, that your thoughts had been sufficiently  
 digested; however I leave candid readers to com-  
 pare my questions with your replies, and to de-  
 termine on the merits of the case, only taking no-  
 tice of an assertion which stands in your return  
 to my *third* query. My *third* query was\*, "If  
 Baptism, considered as a religious rite, does in  
 its nature represent the *burial* and *resurrection* of  
 Christ, as our opponent argues, we ask when it  
 took that signification; especially, seeing *John*  
 and the *Apostles* baptized so many thousands  
 before it was so much as known that Christ  
 should suffer and rise from the dead?" Under  
 your

† *Reviewer Reviewed*, &c. p. 128, &c. ‡ *Observ.* &c.  
 p. 72, &c. \* *Reviewer Reviewed*, &c. p. 129, &c.

\* *Ob*  
 6,—



*Mentz",*

\* *Observ. Ec.* page 73.—† *Matt.* xxvi. 1, 2.—‡ *ver.* 6,—13.—§ *Luke* xxii. 15.—¶ *1 Cor.* xi. 23, 24.

*Mentz*," who you tell us§, "at the Diet of *Augs-  
burgh* angrily laid by a Bible in which he had  
been reading some time," with this profane speech,  
'Truly I know not what this book is, *but*, I  
*perceive it makes all against us*,'—"yet I must freely  
say, I think it is very evident, you did not con-  
sult "the New Testament," "by the single de-  
cision" of which you charge me\* with a "seem-  
ing unwillingness to abide," so attentively as you  
should, when you expressed the assertion I have  
just mentioned, and, to use the words of *a certain  
writer*, of whom I believe you have some opinion†  
"This—Sir—shews to what unreasonable and  
strange lengths some people will go, rather than  
renounce a fav'rite hypothesis."

Your attempt towards the end of your pam-  
phlet, to prove "that" (as, "with" the writer‡  
whom you have often quoted, "you observe")  
'The *Independents*', whom in a former part of your  
*Observations*¶, you compliment (whether seriously  
or not, you best know) with the character "of a  
discerning people," 'are the most inconsistent of  
any set of people upon this subject,' is not I  
think,

§ *Observ. &c.* p. 69, &c.—\* *Ibid.*—† p. 68

‡ *Mr. Maclean.*—|| p. 75.—¶ p. 4.



think, well conducted. You write, in the very same sentence, where you are pleased to pay them the just-mentioned compliment, "You have often wondered that the Pædobaptists, and especially the Independents, are not yet convinced of the *bad policy* of publishing any thing upon baptism." Whether their "*bad policy*" appears in ~~any~~ "publishing any thing" on that subject, which you *imagine* yourself able effectually to overturn, I will not say, but, *this* I must say, it is certainly very unfair, to hold them up to public view in the manner in which you let your readers know Mr. *Maclean's* pen has represented them, and that with your approbation. 'They' do, "indeed, as *that writer* says, 'admit that the people of the new covenant are distinguished from those of the old, by their having God's law written in their hearts—that the subjects of Christ's kingdom are distinguished from the world, by their being of the truth, and hearing his voice—and that this distinction is only visible to us in the profession of their faith'—"; yet *they* no where say, that *such only* are "the subjects of Christ's kingdom." They believe, that to affirm *this*, would be to contradict their MASTER, who has expressly declared, concerning *the infants of his professing people*, "*of such is the king-*

dom of God\*, " i.e. as we understand it, that they, with their parents, are members of the gospel-kingdom, to be *received in his name*, and treated as *belonging to him*†. But, where, Sir, do the *Independents* assert, as *the Author whose words you introduce and approve*, represents them†, "—' that their being the natural seed of believers, sufficiently marks them out as children of God'—"? You know it is *your own principle*§, " that all who die in infancy, the offspring of *unbelievers* as well as of believers, *enter into bliss*," surely then we cannot be called inconsistent, because we plead for the salvation of *the infants of believers*, on the ground of the *promise*, and declarations of the word of God, while, as to the *infants of others*, we leave them in the hands of *the judge of all the earth*, who will do right, at the same time professing, that, *what the holy Scriptures no where tell us, either in express words, or, by just consequence, we do not pretend to know*.

" The offspring of believers," *when adult*, were always treated in religious matters, on their own *personal* profession and conduct. Had a son of *Abraham*, notwithstanding his admission during infancy, into the old Testament church,

*when*

\* *Mark*, x. 14.—† ix. 37, 41.

† *Objerv. &c.* p. last.—§ p. 41.



when he became capable of acting for himself; refused to observe the ordinances of the God of Israel, his right to the peculiar privileges of that church would from that instant have been vacated, and, he have been treated as a transgressor of the law, in his own person. In like manner, we do not plead that, those who were in their infancy admitted into the christian church ought to be continued as such, unless, when they live beyond this tender age, they obey the laws of Christ, or act agreeably to the rules of the gospel. This would be, indeed, to say, that the children of the flesh are the children of God; that, being born of believing parents sufficiently secured their salvation; positions, which, whosoever they be who charge us with maintaining, we neither believe, approve, nor assert. Surely, therefore, they must greatly misapprehend, or grossly misrepresent, who affirm, concerning the *Independents*, (as you assure us\* Mr. Maclean and you do) that they insist that their [those who are "born of believing parents"] "being the natural seed of believers, sufficiently marks them out as children of God."—

Here, Sir, I might request you seriously to let me know, who are, in your view, "the natural

H 3

seed

\* p. last.

seed of believers ? ” Must we turn to ‘ *the Laws of England* ’ ? The writer you have so frequently introduced assures us, (as you let us know in a former part of your *Observations*\*) these ‘call all persons infants, who are under the age of twenty-one,’ but will the Bible warrant us to esteem the *Fathers* of all such believers ? I leave these matters to your consideration, and entreat you will let the *Independents* speak their own language. Quote your authors fairly, and then leave the public to judge, whether they be “inconsistent” or not. This every writer ought to do, and it might be supposed you would have adhered to this method with the strictest punctuality, since, even in your *Title-page*, the reader is exhorted to “*buy the Truth.*” Should not He, who has placed this just and wise precept in the front of his pamphlet, have been careful to have *said nothing else* !

I am now, Sir, brought to the end of your *Observations*, which close with a very remarkable assertion, of which some notice must be taken. You affirm, that “*Dr. Watts told his friend Mr. G. that he wished infant baptism was laid aside.*” “*Mr. G.*” here introduced, is I find, the present Rev. Dr. GIBBONS of London. Though in religious matters I would be determined by

no



no human authority whatever, yet thinking so respectable a name as that of Dr. *Watts* might have weight with some minds, for which reason, it may be presumed, you introduced it, I made it my business to enquire into the merits of this assertion, and having received a *Letter from that Gentleman to whom you affirm the Doctor told it*, I think proper to insert it for the inspection of the public.

---

“ REVEREND SIR,

**I** Find it has been asserted in a late publication that Dr. *Watts* declared to me, (for I am said to be the person referred to, though only the initial letter of my name, and not my name at length, is printed) that *He wished infant baptism was laid aside*. It is not a little disagreeable to me, that what I mentioned casually in conversation, without the least apprehension I should hear of it again, in the public manner I have done, should have come into the press, and thence be communicated to the world. But, as this has been the case, it may not be improper, nay, it may have become necessary, for

me

me to give a plain account of the matter, which I shall do, with the strictest regard to truth, and without the least tincture of partiality.

The Doctor and myself were one day, perhaps two or three years before his decease, in a free converse together, when (I cannot recollect how the subject was introduced) he expressed himself to this purpose, 'That he had sometimes thought of a compromise with our Baptist Brethren, by their giving up their mode of baptism, immersion, on the one side, and our giving up the baptism, of infants on the other, as he had not observed any benefit arising from the administration of the ordinance to them.' This was the whole, from what I remember, the Doctor said upon the point, which, in my opinion, falls much short of a declaration from him, that he *wished infant baptism was laid aside.*—I have to add, he gave me, perhaps it might not be more than a few months before his death, *a written defence of his upon Baptism*, in which he largely argues for its extension to the infants of believing parents, and at the end of it he expresses himself, 'that though the reasons we have for the practice of baptizing children are not so strong and evident, as if we had some express precept, or plain indu-  
bitable



bitable examples of it, yet there seems to be a considerable force in the proof, that it is a Divine ordinance, sufficient to incline me to chuse this side of the question, and to practise accordingly.'

It may not be improper to observe, that, if the Doctor had wished to have had infant-baptism laid aside, how came it to pass, that perhaps some years after the above-recited conversation, he should give me, as my own property, *A Discourse in Defence of Infant-Baptism*, and this with an annexed Declaration of his opinion and practice in favour of it? Or, if he had, in some of his last weeks or months of his Life, as he was in possession of his understanding, even on his Death-bed, as I, myself, was a present witness, decided in his own judgment, against the baptism of infants, why had he not spoken to me concerning the Discourse he had given me expressly in support of that practice, or at least have desired me to strike out the profession of his sentiments on the head, at the close of it?

Though it is far from being pleasing to me, to be obliged to communicate the above account, for the reasons I have suggested, yet, feeling myself

self under a kind of necessity to do it, I have no objection against your shewing what I have written to any person who may be desirous of knowing the truth of the affair, nor, if you think proper, of printing it.

*I am, your sincere Friend,*

*And Servant,*

*London,*

*June 22, 1782.*

**THOMAS GIBBONS."**

**"The Rev. Mr. Carter,**

***Mattishall, Norfolk."***

Thus, Sir, I leave the public to judge what were the sentiments of Dr. *Watts*, respecting the subject under debate, when they are told, that not more than a few Months before his death, he gave to his friend Dr. Gibbons, a written Discourse in Defence of Infant-baptism, annexing a declaration that there was a considerable force in the proof of its being a divine ordinance sufficient to incline him to chuse that side of the question, and to practise accordingly.

Wishing



( 97 )

Wishing "that these Letters may, in some measure, contribute to give you the same views of the Scripture-account of this ordinance, which Dr. *Watts*" had when he made the above declaration,

*I remain,*

S I R,

*Mattisball,*

*Your humble Servant,*

*August 26, 1782.*

JOHN CARTER.

FINIS.



*Published by the AUTHOR of these Letters,*

SHORT STRICTURES

10-AU59  
O-N

INFANT-BAPTISM;

B E I N G

The SUBSTANCE of a DISCOURSE

Delivered on that SUBJECT.—Price 4d.

---

T H E

REVIEWER REVIEWED;

OR A REPLY TO THE

Rev. Mr. RICHARDS'S REVIEW

OF STRICTURES

ON INFANT-BAPTISM.

In the Course of which

Some THOUGHTS are delivered on

Mr. Wilson's SCRIPTURE MANUAL—Price. 1s.



